

Interagency Committee for Outdoor
Recreation

360/902-3000
360/902-3026 (fax)
email: info@iac.wa.gov



Salmon Recovery Funding Board

360/902-2636
360/902-3026 (fax)
email: salmon@iac.wa.gov

STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

1111 Washington Street SE
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

October 25, 2004

SUBJECT: SRFB Meeting - Unspent Funds Discussion Documents

In February 2004 the SRFB adopted a policy addressing the disposition of unspent funds arising from salmon habitat grants issued in 1999 for projects funded by the US Fish and Wildlife Service through the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) and later administered by the SRFB. The 165 GSRO projects were completed and all reports submitted to the USFWS by the deadline of September 24, 2004. Out of the original allocation of nearly \$20 million, approximately \$1.1 million (or 5 percent) was left unspent. This money was returned to U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

In an effort to provide clarity to the process dealing with unspent funds, and to ensure successful implementation of projects who receive grant funds, the SRFB has begun the process of drafting guidance for the disposition of potential unspent funds arising from all other SRFB projects issued from 2000 to present (please review the attached project management report).

Towards this end, staff worked with the SRFB Administration Sub-committee to present a status report on this subject at the June 2004 SRFB meeting. The Board directed staff to continue working with the Sub-committee to further refine a draft policy for presentation at the October 2004 SRFB meeting.

Staff has worked with Sub-committee members Brenda McMurray and Dick Wallace to develop a draft approach for grant rounds 1, 2, 3, and 4, with planned work on a separate alternative for grant rounds 5 and later. Attached is a diagram illustrating the potential disposition of unspent funds from projects that start on time and those that experience a delayed start for grant rounds 1, 2, 3, and 4 (2000 – 2004). In addition, the guidance outlines a process in which projects would go through a review by staff, the director and/or the Sub-committee if progress on a project was not being achieved within a certain timeline. The intent is to help ensure a high level of timeliness and success rate for funded projects, in everyone's interest given the effort involved in the SRFB application and review process.

A challenge for the Sub-committee and staff continues to be one of developing incentives and methods for sponsors and lead entities to complete projects on time, and on or under budget, with as few amendments as possible. Towards this end, the next step will entail consulting with lead entities and sponsors about how to best create incentives or rewards as a means to encourage completion of projects on time and on budget.

The Sub-committee believes the May 2000 Authority Matrix has been useful in providing direction on amendment requests. The role of the Sub-committee and matrix will undergo review to determine the need for changes that reflect any policy adoption made by the SRFB regarding unspent funds, as well as minor clarifications.

In light of the above, the Sub-committee and staff seek input and guidance from SRFB, project sponsors and lead entities in developing a final proposal for Board consideration in early 2005. Questions include:

1. Are there incentives or approaches for rewarding project sponsors or lead entities for projects or project lists that are completed on time, on budget and accomplish the original scope contracted? How might this incentive be different for grant rounds 1 – 4, versus 5 and later?
2. What incentive approaches could be considered for rewarding project sponsors or lead entities for project or project lists that are completed on time, accomplish the original scope contracted, and are UNDER budget. How might this incentive be different for grant rounds 1 – 4, versus 5 and after?
3. Should the incentive be granted to the project sponsor or the lead entity?
4. What is a disincentive for changing the scope of a project, changing the budget (i.e., cost increases), or timeline of a project?
5. Would technical assistance in the form of help with cost estimations, budgets, designs, work plans and timelines, and scope of work be helpful to project sponsors or lead entities PRIOR to grant application development? (If so, would this be prior to grants being submitted to the lead entity, or to the SRFB)?

The Sub-committee is looking for feedback so that the adoption of an unspent funds policy for grants rounds 1 – 4, and 5 and onward can be adopted at its January meeting.

Comments should be submitted to Tammy Owings by November 22, 2004. We will share a brief update with the Board in December, and prepare a final draft for review and adoption in early 2005.

Interagency Committee For Outdoor Recreation

360/902-3000
360/902-3026 (fax)
email: info@iac.wa.gov



Salmon Recovery Funding Board

360/902-2636
360/902-3026 (fax)
email: salmon@iac.wa.gov

STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

1111 Washington Street SE
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

October 18, 2004

TO: SRFB Members and Designees

FROM: Laura E. Johnson, Director

PREPARED BY: Rollie Geppert, Manager Salmon & Habitat Section

SUBJECT: October 2004 Division Report

Project Management Activities

Fifth Round: On July 16 the lead entities submitted 187 projects to the IAC for consideration. The applicants later withdrew three projects and staff identified three additional projects as not meeting the SRFB's eligibility requirements. Of the 178 remaining projects, the technical advisors performed multiple reviews to conclude on October 7 that 27 are projects of concern. Updated information will be available at the October SRFB meeting.

Completed Projects: From April 1999 to September 10, 2004 sponsors of the 165 projects funded by the US Fish and Wildlife Service through the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office completed their projects and provided all final documents to the IAC. Staff completed its final report to the US Fish and Wildlife Service on September 24. This marks the completion of the Board's first federally funded salmon habitat grant program.

Fifty-three percent of the 703 funded salmon habitat projects have been completed and are potentially providing positive benefits to salmon and their habitats. The "# Completed Monitor" column lists the number of projects where the substantive habitat restoration work has been completed, but the files are being held in active status until the monitoring components have been completed.

Engineered Log Jam (ELJ) Monitoring Projects:

In 2001, as part of the Second Round Cycle, the Board funded two ELJ monitoring projects, at the Elwha and the North Fork Stillaguamish Rivers. The Lower Elwha-Klallam Tribe (01-1085N) and Washington Trout (01-1193N) implement the two monitoring projects, respectively.

Both projects have completed their third year of monitoring the ELJs under their SRFB grant contracts. A cover memorandum and summaries for the Elwha and North Fork Stillaguamish River projects are attached to this memorandum. Both the Lower Elwha-Klallam Tribe and Washington Trout will continue to provide annual written reports and in 2006 provide a final comprehensive five-year monitoring report and presentation to the Board.

Project Administration

Funding Cycle	Fiscal Year	# Active Projects	# Pending Projects	# Completed Projects	# Completed Monitor	Total
GSRO Federal 1999	1999	0	0	165	0	165
Early Action (IRT) State 1999	1999	2	0	92	0	94
SRFB – Early 2000	2000	45	0	34	1	80
SRFB – Second Round 2000	2001	88	0	56	4	148
SRFB – Third Round 2001	2002	113	1	16	1	131
SRFB - Fourth Round 2002	2003	80	1	4	0	85
Totals		328	2	367	6	703
Percent		46.7	0.1	53.2		100

IRT =Interagency Review Team; GSRO = Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

Disposition of Unspent SRFB Funds Fiscal 2000-2004
(Grant Rounds 1, 2, 3, 4)

